

REMARKS

Prior to entry of the above amendments, claims 1-16 were pending in the present application. Claims 1-7 are cancelled without prejudice, waiver or disclaimer. Claims 19-22 are newly added. No new matter is introduced into the present application. Claims 8-16 and 19-22 are now pending in the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present claims in view of the following remarks.

I. Cancelled Claims

Claims 1-7 are cancelled without prejudice, waiver or disclaimer. Therefore, the rejections of claims 1-7 are rendered moot.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,292,890 to Crisan (hereinafter "*Crisan*"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

A. Claims 8-14 are allowable.

Claim 8 recites a method for specifying a boot order for a plurality of mass storage devices within a computer system, each of the plurality of mass storage devices being a one of one or more mass storage device types. The method of claim 8 includes: determining for each of the plurality of mass storage device types whether more than one mass storage device exists within the computer system; providing a boot order menu including one or more menu items comprising a menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type for which more than one device of the device type exists, the menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type being included in the boot order menu responsive to determining that more than one mass storage device exists for the mass storage device type, the menu items of the boot order menu being orderable to specify the boot order for the computer system; providing a device type menu for at least one of the menu items of the boot order menu corresponding to the mass storage device types for which more than one mass storage device exists within the computer system, the device type menu including entries corresponding to each of the mass storage devices of the

device type, and the entries of the device type menu being orderable to specify the boot order for each of the mass storage devices of the device type; and attempting to boot the computer system.

Before discussing how claim 8 distinguishes over the teaching of *Crisan*, Applicant would like to respectfully note that the current Office Action fails to specifically point out how *Crisan* teaches each and every recitation of claim 8. Instead, the Office Action notes that *Crisan* allegedly teaches claim 8, but only compares *Crisan* to the recitations of claim 1. However, claim 1 and claim 8 of the current application include substantially different recitations. Since the Office Action fails to specifically point out how *Crisan* teaches each and every recitation of claim 8, Applicant respectfully requests that a subsequent Office Action, if any, received regarding the current application not be made final.

Crisan does not teach or suggest a method for specifying a boot order for a plurality of mass storage devices within a computer system, each of the plurality of mass storage devices being a one of one or more mass storage device types, as recited by claim 8. In contrast, *Crisan* describes a computer system with a dynamically reconfigurable boot order. *Crisan* teaches that a computer examines a received “wake-up” packet to determine a boot order to be used by the computer. *Crisan* also provides an example of a boot table which specifies a default boot order and teaches that a computer user can manually *reconfigure the default* boot order.

This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 8 because *Crisan* fails to teach or suggest providing a boot order menu including one or more menu items comprising a menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type for which more than one device of the device type exists. Instead, *Crisan* teaches that a boot table includes a listing of boot *devices*, without teaching or suggesting providing a boot order menu including one or more menu items comprising a menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type for which more than one device of the device type exists. For example, the device list in column 5, lines 48-54 of *Crisan* lists NETWORK DRIVE #1 and NETWORK DRIVE #2 as separate entries instead of providing an entry corresponding to the device type NETWORK DRIVE.

Furthermore, *Crisan* fails to teach or suggest the menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type being included in the boot order menu responsive to determining that more than one mass storage device exists for the mass storage device type. Instead, as mentioned above, *Crisan* teaches that a boot table includes a listing of boot devices. Note that the device list in column 5, lines 48-54 of *Crisan* is merely an example of a popular boot order for boot devices. Each item in *Crisan*'s device list is not provided responsive to determining that more than one mass storage device exists for the mass storage device type.

Moreover, *Crisan* fails to teach or suggest providing a device type menu for at least one of the menu items of the boot order menu corresponding to the mass storage device types. Instead, as mentioned above, *Crisan* teaches that a boot table includes a listing of boot devices, without teaching or suggesting a device type menu. The device list in column 5, lines 48-54 of *Crisan* is not a device type menu but, as noted above, is merely an example of a popular boot order for boot devices. Furthermore, *Crisan* does not teach or suggest two related menus: a device type menu and a boot order menu.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 8 is allowable over *Crisan*. Since claims 9-14 depend from claim 8 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that *Crisan* does not anticipate Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 9-14. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 15 and 16 are allowable.

Claim 15 recites a method for specifying a boot order for a plurality of mass storage devices within a computer system, each of the plurality of mass storage devices being a one of one or more mass storage device types. The method of claim 15 includes: providing a computer BIOS operative to permit the boot order of the mass storage devices to be specified in one of two possible modes of operation, wherein the first mode of operation comprises, providing a single user interface menu through which the boot order for the computer system may be specified by arranging in order identifiers corresponding to each of the plurality of mass storage devices, and attempting to boot the computer system from the plurality of mass storage devices in the specified order; and wherein the second mode of operation comprises, determining for each of the plurality of

mass storage device types whether more than one mass storage device exists within the computer system, providing a boot order menu including one or more menu items comprising a menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type for which more than one device of the device type exists, the menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type being included in the boot order menu responsive to determining that more than one mass storage device exists for the mass storage device type, the menu items of the boot order menu being orderable to specify the boot order for the computer system; providing a device type menu for at least one of the menu items of the boot order menu corresponding to the mass storage device types for which more than one mass storage device exists within the computer system, the device type menu including entries corresponding to each of the mass storage devices of the device type, and the entries of the device type menu being orderable to specify the boot order for each of the mass storage devices of the device type, and attempting to boot the computer system from the plurality of mass storage devices in the order specified by the boot order menu.

Before discussing how claim 15 distinguishes over the teaching of *Crisan*, Applicant would like to respectfully note that the current Office Action fails to specifically point out how *Crisan* teaches each and every recitation of claim 15. Instead, the Office Action notes that *Crisan* allegedly teaches claim 15, but only compares *Crisan* to the recitations of claim 1. However, claim 1 and claim 15 of the current application include substantially different recitations. Since the Office Action fails to specifically point out how *Crisan* teaches each and every recitation of claim 15, Applicant respectfully requests that a subsequent Office Action, if any, received regarding the current application not be made final.

Crisan does not teach or suggest a method for specifying a boot order for a plurality of mass storage devices within a computer system, each of the plurality of mass storage devices being a one of one or more mass storage device types, as recited by claim 15. In contrast, as discussed above, *Crisan* describes a computer system with a dynamically reconfigurable boot order. *Crisan* teaches that a computer examines a received “wake-up” packet to determine a boot order to be used by the computer. *Crisan* also provides an example of a boot table which specifies a default boot order and teaches that a computer user can manually *reconfigure the default* boot order.

This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 15 because *Crisan* fails to teach or suggest providing a boot order menu including one or more menu items comprising a menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type for which more than one device of the device type exists. Instead, *Crisan* teaches that a boot table includes a listing of boot *devices*, without teaching or suggesting providing a boot order menu including one or more menu items comprising a menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type for which more than one device of the device type exists. For example, as note above, the device list in column 5, lines 48-54 of *Crisan* lists NETWORK DRIVE #1 and NETWORK DRIVE #2 as separate entries instead of providing an entry corresponding to the device type NETWORK DRIVE.

Furthermore, *Crisan* fails to teach or suggest the menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type being included in the boot order menu responsive to determining that more than one mass storage device exists for the mass storage device *type*. Instead, as mentioned above, *Crisan* teaches that a boot table includes a listing of boot *devices*. Note that the device list in column 5, lines 48-54 of *Crisan* is merely an example of a popular boot order for boot devices. Each item in *Crisan*'s device list is not provided responsive to determining that more than one mass storage device exists for the mass storage device type.

Moreover, *Crisan* fails to teach or suggest providing a device type menu for at least one of the menu items of the boot order menu corresponding to the mass storage device types. Instead, as mentioned above, *Crisan* teaches that a boot table includes a listing of boot *devices*, without teaching or suggesting a device type menu. The device list in column 5, lines 48-54 of *Crisan* is not a device type menu but, as noted above, is merely an example of a popular boot order for boot devices. Furthermore, *Crisan* does not teach or suggest two related menus: a device type menu and a boot order menu.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 15 is allowable over *Crisan*. Since claims 16 depends from claim 15 and recites further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that *Crisan* does not anticipate Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claim 16. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,990,685 to Christensen al. (hereinafter “*Christensen*”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

A. Claims 8-14 are allowable.

Claim 8 recites a method for specifying a boot order for a plurality of mass storage devices within a computer system, each of the plurality of mass storage devices being a one of one or more mass storage device types. The method of claim 8 includes: determining for each of the plurality of mass storage device types whether more than one mass storage device exists within the computer system; providing a boot order menu including one or more menu items comprising a menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type for which more than one device of the device type exists, the menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type being included in the boot order menu responsive to determining that more than one mass storage device exists for the mass storage device type, the menu items of the boot order menu being orderable to specify the boot order for the computer system; providing a device type menu for at least one of the menu items of the boot order menu corresponding to the mass storage device types for which more than one mass storage device exists within the computer system, the device type menu including entries corresponding to each of the mass storage devices of the device type, and the entries of the device type menu being orderable to specify the boot order for each of the mass storage devices of the device type; and attempting to boot the computer system.

Before discussing how claim 8 distinguishes over the teaching of *Christensen*, Applicant would like to respectfully note that the current Office Action fails to specifically point out how *Christensen* teaches each and every recitation of claim 8. Instead, the Office Action notes that *Christensen* allegedly teaches claim 8, but only compares *Christensen* to the recitations of claim 1. However, claim 1 and claim 8 of the current application include substantially different recitations. Since the Office Action fails to specifically point out how *Christensen* teaches each and every recitation of claim 8, Applicant respectfully requests that a subsequent Office Action, if any, received regarding the current application not be made final.

Christensen does not teach or suggest a method for specifying a boot order for a plurality of mass storage devices within a computer system, each of the plurality of mass storage devices being a one of one or more mass storage device types, as recited by claim 8. In contrast, *Christensen* describes a method for booting a computer system and determining the boot order of a computer system including displaying a list of the bootable devices of the computer system in the current boot order in response to receiving instructions from a user to enter the computer system's setup routine. *Christensen* describes that the displayed list of bootable devices identifies the name and physical location of each bootable device of the computer system such that two bootable devices that are identical can be positively identified by the devices' locations in the computer system. *Christensen* also describes that the current boot order of the bootable devices can be modified by highlighting a bootable device in the displayed list of bootable devices and moving the bootable device up or down in the boot order using up or down arrow keys and that the computer system can be rebooted in accordance with the modified boot order.

This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 8 because *Christensen* fails to teach or suggest providing a boot order menu including one or more menu items comprising a menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type for which more than one device of the device type exists. Instead, *Christensen* teaches that the displayed list of bootable devices includes the name and location of each bootable device of the computer system, without teaching or suggesting providing a boot order menu including one or more menu items comprising a menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type for which more than one device of the device type exists. For example, as illustrated in FIG. 4, *Christensen* teaches that adapters XYZ SCSI, MNO SCSI, and DEF SCSI are listed separately as entries one, two, and four, respectively, instead of teaching or suggesting that the list of bootable devices includes an entry corresponding to the device type SCSI Adapter.

Furthermore, *Christensen* fails to teach or suggest the menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type being included in the boot order menu responsive to determining that more than one mass storage device exists for the mass storage device type. Instead, as mentioned above, *Christensen* describes that the displayed list of

bootable devices identifies the name and physical location of each bootable device of the computer system, without teaching or suggesting the menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type being included in the boot order menu responsive to determining that more than one mass storage device exists for the mass storage device *type*. For example, in *Christensen*, bootable devices are identified in a list of bootable devices regardless of whether more than one mass storage device exists for the mass storage device type.

Moreover, *Christensen* fails to teach or suggest providing a device type menu for at least one of the menu items of the boot order menu corresponding to the mass storage device types. Instead, as mentioned above, *Christensen* describes that the displayed list of bootable devices identifies the name and physical location of each bootable device of the computer system, without teaching or suggesting providing a device type menu. The device list shown in FIG. 4 of *Christensen* is not a device type menu but rather a list of bootable devices. Furthermore, *Christensen* does not teach or suggest two related menus: a boot order menu and a device type menu.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 8 is allowable over *Christensen*. Since claims 9-14 depend from claim 8 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that *Christensen* does not anticipate Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 9-14. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 15 and 16 are allowable.

Claim 15 recites a method for specifying a boot order for a plurality of mass storage devices within a computer system, each of the plurality of mass storage devices being a one of one or more mass storage device types. The method of claim 15 includes: providing a computer BIOS operative to permit the boot order of the mass storage devices to be specified in one of two possible modes of operation, wherein the first mode of operation comprises, providing a single user interface menu through which the boot order for the computer system may be specified by arranging in order identifiers corresponding to each of the plurality of mass storage devices, and attempting to boot the computer system from the plurality of mass storage devices in the specified order; and wherein the second mode of operation comprises, determining for each of the plurality of mass storage device types whether more than one mass storage device exists within the

computer system, providing a boot order menu including one or more menu items comprising a menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type for which more than one device of the device type exists, the menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type being included in the boot order menu responsive to determining that more than one mass storage device exists for the mass storage device type, the menu items of the boot order menu being orderable to specify the boot order for the computer system; providing a device type menu for at least one of the menu items of the boot order menu corresponding to the mass storage device types for which more than one mass storage device exists within the computer system, the device type menu including entries corresponding to each of the mass storage devices of the device type, and the entries of the device type menu being orderable to specify the boot order for each of the mass storage devices of the device type, and attempting to boot the computer system from the plurality of mass storage devices in the order specified by the boot order menu.

Before discussing how claim 15 distinguishes over the teaching of *Christensen*, Applicant would like to respectfully note that the current Office Action fails to specifically point out how *Christensen* teaches each and every recitation of claim 15. Instead, the Office Action notes that *Christensen* allegedly teaches claim 15, but only compares *Christensen* to the recitations of claim 1. However, claim 1 and claim 15 of the current application include substantially different recitations. Since the Office Action fails to specifically point out how *Christensen* teaches each and every recitation of claim 15, Applicant respectfully requests that a subsequent Office Action, if any, received regarding the current application not be made final.

Christensen does not teach or suggest a method for specifying a boot order for a plurality of mass storage devices within a computer system, each of the plurality of mass storage devices being a one of one or more mass storage device types, as recited by claim 15. In contrast, *Christensen* describes a method for booting a computer system and determining the boot order of a computer system including displaying a list of the bootable devices of the computer system in the current boot order in response to receiving instructions from a user to enter the computer system's setup routine. *Christensen* describes that the displayed list of bootable devices identifies the name and physical location of each bootable device of the computer system such that two

bootable devices that are identical can be positively identified by the devices' locations in the computer system. *Christensen* also describes that the current boot order of the bootable devices can be modified by highlighting a bootable device in the displayed list of bootable devices and moving the bootable device up or down in the boot order using up or down arrow keys and that the computer system can be rebooted in accordance with the modified boot order.

This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 15 because *Christensen* fails to teach or suggest providing a boot order menu including one or more menu items comprising a menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type for which more than one device of the device type exists. Instead, *Christensen* teaches that the displayed list of bootable devices includes the name and location of each bootable device of the computer system, without teaching or suggesting providing a boot order menu including one or more menu items comprising a menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type for which more than one device of the device type exists. For example, as illustrated in FIG. 4, *Christensen* teaches that adapters XYZ SCSI, MNO SCSI, and DEF SCSI are listed separately as entries one, two, and four, respectively, instead of teaching or suggesting that the list of bootable devices includes an entry corresponding to the device type SCSI Adapter.

Furthermore, *Christensen* fails to teach or suggest the menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type being included in the boot order menu responsive to determining that more than one mass storage device exists for the mass storage device type. Instead, as mentioned above, *Christensen* describes that the displayed list of bootable devices identifies the name and physical location of each bootable device of the computer system, without teaching or suggesting the menu item corresponding to a mass storage device type being included in the boot order menu responsive to determining that more than one mass storage device exists for the mass storage device type. For example, in *Christensen*, bootable devices are identified in a list of bootable devices regardless of whether more than one mass storage device exists for the mass storage device type.

Moreover, *Christensen* fails to teach or suggest providing a device type menu for at least one of the menu items of the boot order menu corresponding to the mass storage device types. Instead, as mentioned above, *Christensen* describes that the displayed list

of bootable devices identifies the name and physical location of each bootable device of the computer system, without teaching or suggesting providing a device type menu. The device list shown in FIG. 4 of *Christensen* is not a device type menu but rather a list of bootable devices. Furthermore, *Christensen* does not teach or suggest two related menus: a boot order menu and a device type menu.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 15 is allowable over *Christensen*. Since claim 16 depends from claim 15 and recites further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that *Christensen* does not anticipate Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claim 16. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Newly Added Claims 19-22

Newly added claims 19-22 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable claim 15. Newly added claim 22 is allowable for at least the reason that it depends from allowable claim 8. Note that claims 19 and 20 are supported in the current application by at least FIG. 1 and its related description, while claims 21 and 22 are supported by at least FIG. 5 and its related description.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicant asserts that the pending claims 8-16 and 19-22 are in condition for allowance. Applicant further asserts that this response addresses each and every point of the Office Action, and respectfully requests that the Examiner pass this application with claims 8-16 and 19-22 to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact Applicant's attorney at 404.815.1900.

Respectfully submitted,
HOPE BALDAUFF HARTMAN, LLC

Date: July 24, 2007

/Sami O. Malas/

Sami O. Malas
Reg. No. 44,893

Hope Baldauff Hartman, LLC
1720 Peachtree Street, NW
Suite 1010
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Telephone: 404.815.1900

